

UNIVERSITY OF TARTU
COLLEGE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES

**ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN PRE-INTERMEDIATE LEVEL EFL
CLASSROOM**

MA Thesis

MERLI LEEMET

SUPERVISOR: *Lect.* NATALJA ZAGURA

TARTU

2015

ABSTRACT

Examining oral correction strategies in the context of form-focused activities in an EFL classroom may help teachers in their efforts to critically analyse the methods of correction they use in their daily routines. The aim of the present observational study is to find out which correction strategies are most commonly used in the context of focus-on-form activities in a pre-intermediate EFL classroom and how productive they are in terms of managing interaction and language acquisition. To this end, the approach of Conversation Analysis is utilised. Selected fragments of interaction have been transcribed in a line-by-line account and analysed with special emphasis on types of oral corrective feedback and their influence on elicitation of learners' self-correction.

The Introduction provides the rationale for the research and the aims of the thesis, as well as outlining its structure. Chapter I contains a brief overview of the research done in the field of Corrective Feedback (CF) and L2 teaching so far. The central focus has been put on six different types of CF and the connection between CF and learner uptake. Additionally, it provides an overview of CA's perspective on interaction in the classroom, which states that contexts in the classroom are socially constructed by participants in response to a pedagogic goal. Within the CA framework CF falls under the umbrella of repair, and it is important to understand the treatment of error in both CA and mainstream SLA studies. Thus, different repair trajectories, repair-initiators and the ways repair is embodied in a pedagogical context are described. The next section focuses on the distinction made between form-focused instruction and meaning-focused instruction, and the differences in controlling the pattern of communication in each context. Chapter II deals with the methodology and the procedure of data collection and analysis. The primary data consist of audio recorded teacher-student interaction and contain 39 fragments of interaction where the use of CF was identified. The total length of the corpus is 210 minutes of recordings. The selected fragments of interaction have been categorised according to the patterns of CF strategies used and then analysed. The analysis is followed by Discussion where the findings are examined more closely. The Conclusion summarises the findings; it is followed by a list of sources, Appendices with transcription conventions and the collection of excerpts used for analysis and Resümee (in Estonian).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	2
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	4
INTRODUCTION.....	5
CHAPTER I	9
1.1. Errors and Corrective Feedback	9
1.2 Learner uptake	17
1.3 Conversation Analysis (CA) approach compared to Second Language Acquisition (SLA) approach.....	19
1.4. Focus-on-Form Instruction (FFI).....	25
CHAPTER II	28
2.1. Participants and Data	28
2.2. Methodology.....	28
2.3. Analysis of the corpus	29
2.3.1. The use of recasts	30
2.3.2. The use of prompts.....	34
2.4. Discussion	46
Conclusion.....	51
References:	53
APPENDIX 1	58
APPENDIX 2	60
RESÜMEE	65

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

CA – Conversation Analysis

CF- Corrective Feedback

EFL – English as a Foreign Language

FFI – Focus-on-Form Instruction

FLT – foreign language teaching

L2 – second language

SLA – Second Language Acquisition

INTRODUCTION

The role of feedback in general is an extremely important topic when speaking about teaching. One of the essential subjects the students training to become teachers need to master today is feedback. The focus is mainly on the feedback the teacher provides to students concerning his/her subject and evaluation of learning. Recently, there has been a considerable discussion about teachers' own reflection and how analysing their own action in the classroom should lead to more effective work in the future classes. In reality, consistent self-analysis without any other professional feedback is a complicated process. Furthermore, there is no systematic objective feedback that the teachers could take advantage of. Bill Gates (2013) speaks about a survey and a project of a special system that provides teachers thorough feedback on their work. The project and the following survey were carried out in different countries and it proved teachers gaining better results, i.e. their students achieving remarkable outcomes. One of the most important parts of the program was (video) recording the teacher while giving a class and the opportunity for the teacher to conduct a following self-analysis on the basis of the recording. Therefore, whenever the teacher is recording his/her own classes to carry out research, a part of the analysis of the corpus can be the reflection on his/her own work for future improvements.

Not less is important the feedback the teacher needs to provide to students. In L2 learning, one part of it is that students need to be able to correct their own mistakes. Self-correction is expected the more, the higher the level of language acquired (National Curriculum 2010:24). Thus, the teacher needs to provide some help with corrective feedback and encouragement to achieve students' self-correction. In addition, in CEFR different options for reactions depending on the context where learners' mistakes and errors occur are suggested, including immediate correction by the teacher, systematic encouragement of immediate peer-correction to eradicate errors, correcting and analysing errors at a time when

it does not interfere with communication or accepting errors as “transitional interlanguage” and ignoring them (CEFR 2001:155). Therefore, according to CEFR, corrective feedback has an important role in the language learning classroom.

Moreover, the role of feedback is considered in most theories of second language learning and language pedagogy. Researchers in language acquisition have been interested in error research and corrective feedback for decades, particularly in the determination of feedback types that are most effective for practical application in foreign language classrooms. However, as Ellis (2009) concludes, SLA researchers and language educators have frequently disagreed about whether to correct errors at all, what errors to correct, how to correct them, and when to correct them.

Several studies have examined various types of oral corrective feedback in the context of form-focused activities and its effects on second language acquisition (SLA) (Ammar & Spada 2006, Kazuya & Lyster 2010, Lightbown & Spada 1990, Seedhouse 1997, etc.). The organisation of correction in this context is often initiated by the teacher. On the other hand, in different situations, students may actively collaborate in facilitating repair, often surprisingly eagerly. Therefore, it is interesting to see whether the treatment of errors by the teacher has any effect on the result of correction, who eventually produces the correct form or is it produced at all.

Even though the topic of corrective feedback (CF) has been widely the interest of researchers, the results of studies on the second language (L2) teaching are different: they vary in the types of CF studied, the age groups researched, the methodology used, etc. Therefore, the outcomes cannot be carried over to draw conclusions whether it all would work exactly the same way in Estonia. As there is little research on the topic in Estonia, it is important to conduct such a study to collect more data to make it possible to draw conclusions and make generalisations.

The aim of the present paper is to find out what kind of CF strategies are used in a particular context (in form-focused activities) and how productive they are in terms of managing interaction and language acquisition. In this kind of research the details will surface in the course of analysis of students' responses and reactions to the teacher's correction. Therefore, it is possible for the teacher to assume which strategies of CF can be more influential within a particular group of students. The approach of Conversation Analysis (CA) is used to look at the sequences of classroom interaction in EFL classrooms of pre-intermediate level. In CA, correction refers to dealing with any, not just linguistic, problems in speaking, hearing or understanding. In the classroom as well as dealing with mishearing or misunderstandings and error corrections, it also displays the participants' common understanding of what is happening in the learning context. Closer analysis of recorded and transcribed conversations which actually occurred in the classrooms offers a chance to see in detail how the teacher and the students interact. The choice of the methodology for the current research project is supported by the idea of a well-known practitioner of CA Numa Markee (2012), who claims that the teacher recording one's own classroom interaction and using CA methodology to analyse the transcripts gets a great reflection on what is happening in the classroom and it provides the teacher with a great benefit for future work (Evnitskaya 2012:63-64).

The present thesis has been organised in the following way: it starts with an Introduction which provides rationale for the research and aims of the thesis as well as outlines its structure. This is followed by Chapter I, which gives a brief overview of the research done in the field of CF and L2 teaching so far. It looks into six different types of CF and the connection between CF and learner uptake. Additionally, it provides an overview of CA's perspective on interaction in the classroom, which states that contexts in the classroom are socially constructed by participants in response to a pedagogic goal.

Chapter II deals with the methodology used in the research project and the procedure of data collection and analysis. It has also been divided into several sections illustrating and analysing the students' speech, which are then followed by the discussion of findings. The Conclusion summarises the findings and draws some conclusions on the basis of the results. All the transcripts that compose the corpus of the present study can be found in Appendices. The transcripts have been organised and analysed according to the types of CF. Appendix 1 illustrates the transcription conventions used for transcribing the excerpts. Appendix 2 consists of a collection of all excerpts containing the instances of CF.

CHAPTER I

1.1. Errors and Corrective Feedback

Students making mistakes and errors in language learning are one of the main concerns of language teachers. At the same time it is important to make the difference between a mistake and an error. According to Ellis (1994), a significant distinction between mistakes and errors is generally made and they are not treated the same way from a linguistic viewpoint. Corder (1991) states that a mistake is not an issue of knowledge, but it is an issue of its application. Therefore, mistakes can be self-corrected with or without being pointed out to the speaker and it is the teacher's choice whether to ignore a mistake or not as it may just be caused by tiredness or carelessness. Native speakers make such mistakes too. An error, on the other hand, is a deviation from accepted rules of a language made by a learner of the second language and it results from the learner's lack of knowledge of the target language (Ellis 1994:700). Errors are systematic, they occur repeatedly and are not recognizable by the learner. They are a part of the learner's interlanguage and the learner does not consider them as errors. They are errors only from teachers' perspective and others who are aware that the learner has deviated from a grammatical norm (Gass & Selinker 2008:102-103). The term "interlanguage" refers to the separateness of a second language learner's system, a system that has a structurally intermediate status between the native and target language; it is a system based upon the best attempt of learners to provide order and structure to the linguistic stimuli surrounding them. By a gradual process of trial and error and hypothesis testing, learners slowly and tediously succeed in establishing closer and closer approximations to the system used by native speakers of the language (Brown 2000:202-203). In such research it is difficult to distinguish between mistakes and errors, and this is not the aim in itself either. Therefore, the term 'error' is used in the present paper to refer to both mistakes and errors as the term 'error' is also used in most teaching guidebooks and studies, including the studies related to

CF, analysed in the present paper (e.g. Lyster & Ranta 1997, Ellis & Sheen 2006, Lyddon 2011, Ammar & Spada 2006, etc.). In addition, according to definitions of ‘error’ and ‘mistake’ discussed above, mistakes are considered more intrinsic to native speakers and when discussing language teaching and learning for non-native speakers, deviant forms are commonly referred to as errors.

As the discussion above suggests, errors cannot be considered as a symptom of failure but rather as a natural part of learning. In addition, language errors are an important part of the language learning process (Baker & Jones 1998:503). Some framing questions about how the errors in FLT should be treated were used by several researchers over 20 years ago (Allwright & Bailey 1991, Chaudron 1988, DeKyser 1993). At the time, they in turn, had borrowed the questions from Hendrickson (1978) who already used the same questions in one of the first comprehensive reviews of the issue of error correction in the classroom. These questions are as follows:

- Should learners’ errors be corrected?
- When should learners’ errors be corrected?
- Which errors should be corrected?
- How should errors be corrected?
- Who should do the correcting? (Lyster & Ranta 1997:38).

These questions have been explored by scholars over the past two decades in a variety of L2 classroom settings and have been found to be quite complicated. The topic of error correction and its effectiveness, whether it should happen at all and according to which strategies, has remained and the opinions of SLA researchers vary. A big question mark is whether to provide learners with only positive evidence that nativists and rationalists, who according to Chomsky (2000) believe in innate capacity to acquire language, support or to

expose them to negative evidence as well. Those working within nativist paradigm argue that offering learners the target-like language i.e. positive evidence is sufficient while interactionist scholars (e.g. Gass 2003) devote a pivotal role to negative evidence as well. The term negative evidence is often used interchangeably with the terms negative feedback and corrective feedback to refer to any erroneous utterances of language learners (Gass 1997; Schachter 1991). Even though the dilemma of error correction, i.e. to correct or not to correct has continued over the years, currently SLA researchers seem to strongly believe in error correction and CF (Ellis et al 2006, Saxton 1997, White 1991, Carroll & Swain 1993, Lyster & Saito 2010, Lyster 2007, Farrar 1992, etc.). In other words, CF is considered to enhance accuracy in language production.

According to Lightbown and Spada (1990), CF means any indication to the learners that their use of the target language is incorrect. Ellis (2006) specifies that CF can consist of an indication that an error has been committed, provision of the correct target form, or metalinguistic information about the nature of the error, or any combination of these (Ellis et al 2006). CF does not just emphasize the form of language just like the traditional teaching method; it draws students' attention to linguistic forms as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication.

There are various types of CF provided to students. Researchers have classified them differently. One of the easiest and most basic classifications refers to two types of CF, explicit and implicit correction. Explicit correction is typically in the form of a clear indication of an error and the provision of the target-like reformulation (Gass 1997). Implicit corrective feedback indirectly and incidentally draws learners' attention to their non-target like use of certain linguistic features (Ellis 2002). In other words, in the case of implicit feedback, there is no overt indicator that an error has been committed, whereas in explicit feedback there is (Yang 2008). Implicit feedback often takes the form of recasts (Long 1996, Lyster 1998),

while explicit feedback is often operationalized as explicit correction or metalinguistic feedback (Ellis et al 2006).

Lyster and Ranta (1997) identified six types of CF that later other researchers (e.g. Ammar & Spada 2006, Ellis, Lowen & Erlam 2006, Lyddon 2011, etc.) used as the framework for analysis while completing a study on the efficacy of CF. The six types according to Lyster and Ranta (1997) are the following: explicit correction, recast (reformulating), clarification request, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation and repetition. All of these techniques are placed in explicit-implicit continuum. In the following section all of these techniques are elaborated on.

Explicit correction refers to the explicit revision of the correct form. As the teacher provides the correct form, he or she clearly indicates that what the student said was incorrect (Lyster & Ranta 1997:46).

Example 1 (Chu 2011:455)

St: *He take the bus to go to school.*

T: *Oh, you should say he takes. He takes the bus to go to school.*

Thus, the teacher provides both, positive and negative evidence by clearly saying that what the learner has produced is erroneous but at the same time aiding learners in noticing the gap between their interlanguage and the target-like form. However, in providing the target-like reformulation, explicit error correction reduces the need for the learner to produce a modified response. Therefore, in metalinguistic feedback, the teacher only provides students with “comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness” of their utterances (Lyster & Ranta 1997:46).

Recasts. Lyster and Ranta (1997:46) define recast as teacher's reformulation of all parts of a student's utterance minus the error (i.e. the whole student's utterance with necessary modifications of an erroneous form).

Example 2 (Chu 2011:455)

St: *He take the bus to go to school.*

T: *He takes the bus to go to school.*

There is no general agreement among SLA practitioners regarding the effectiveness of recasts due to their limitations. Though some researchers (e.g. Long 2006; Doughty 2001) consider recast as an effective corrective feedback technique, as they are the most effective way to direct attention to form without undue detracting from an overall focus on meaningful communication (Long 1996), others (Lyster 1998; Panova & Lyster 2002) propose that learners usually pass recasts unnoticed and thus they regard them not as effective for interlanguage development. Numerous studies have revealed mixed results of the efficiency or ineffectiveness of recasts (e.g. Lyddon 2011, Lyster & Ranta 1997, Panova & Lyster 2002, etc.) but on the other hand, it affirms that the effectiveness of recasts depends on the targeted form under study (Razaei 2011:24).

Clarification request is the feedback that indicates to students either that their utterance has been misunderstood by the teacher or that the utterance is ill-formed in some way and a repetition or reformulation is required (Lyster & Ranta 1997).

Example 3 (Chu 2011:455)

St: *He take the bus to go to school.*

T: *Pardon me?*

This kind of feedback encapsulates “problems in either comprehension, accuracy, or both” (Lyster & Ranta 1997:47). Clarification requests, unlike explicit error correction, recasts, and translations, can be more consistently relied upon to generate modified output from learners since it might not supply the learners with any information concerning the type or location of the error (Razaei 2011:24).

Metalinguistic feedback. Lyster and Ranta (1997) categorize metalinguistic feedback as comments, information, or questions related to the well-formedness of the student's utterance, without explicitly providing the correct form.

Example 4 (Chu 2011:455)

St: *He take the bus to go to school.*

T: *Do we say he take?*

T: *How do we say when it forms the third person singular form?*

Lyster and Ranta (1997) explain that unlike its name, the inclusion of metalanguage is not its deterministic characteristics of this type of feedback; rather the encoding of evaluations or commentary regarding the non-target-like nature of the learner's utterance is considered as the defining feature. Metalinguistic feedback is divided into three subcategories: metalinguistic comments, metalinguistic information and metalinguistic questions. Metalinguistic comments generally indicate that there is an error somewhere. For example, “Can you find your error?” Metalinguistic information generally provides either some grammatical metalanguage which refers to the nature of the error (e.g. “The subject noun is singular”) or a word definition in the case of lexical errors. Metalinguistic questions also point to the nature of the error but attempt to elicit the information from the student (e.g. “Is the subject plural?”).

Example 5

T: *Look at the picture and say what you see.*

S: *There is a woman.*

T: *Can you tell me what the woman looks like?*

S: *She is tall and her hairs are long.*

T: *HAIRS? This is an uncountable noun.*

S: *So it cannot take plural "s". Ok. Her hair is long.*

T: *That's right.* (Fatemi 2014:536).

As this type of feedback diverts the focus of conversation towards rules or features of the target language, it can be considered as explicit corrective feedback. It challenges learners to reconsider their assumptions regarding the target language form while metalinguistic information applies metalanguage to mark the nature of the error.

Elicitation. Elicitation is a correction technique that prompts the learner to self-correct (Panova & Lyster 2002). This method asks for a direct elicitation of reformulation from students by asking questions such as "How do we say that in English?" or by pausing to allow students to complete the teacher's utterance, or by asking students to reformulate their utterance (Lyster & Ranta 199:48).

Example 6 (Chu 2011:455)

St: *He take the bus to go to school.*

T: *He?*

T: *How do we form the third person singular form in English?*

T: *Can you correct that?*

Elicitation questions differ from questions that are defined as metalinguistic clues in that they require more than a yes/no response.

Repetition. It is simply the teachers' repetition "of the ill-formed part of the student's utterance, usually with a change in intonation" (Lyster & Panova, 2002:584).

Example 7 (Chu 2011:455)

St: *He take the bus to go to school.*

T: *He take?*

This type of feedback is less communicatively intrusive in comparison to explicit error correction or metalinguistic feedback and hence falls at the implicit extreme on the continuum of CF (Razaei 2011:24).

It is hard to draw a clear boundary between implicit and explicit feedback. Some researchers classify recasts as explicit and others as implicit and therefore, the opinions of the efficacy of the methods of feedback differ. In the case of implicit feedback, there is no indicator that an error has been committed, whereas in explicit feedback types, there is (Ellis et al 2006:340). Doughty (2001) and Varela (1998) prove in their experimental studies how recasts are remarkably explicit. If learners did not self-correct after a repetition of their utterance by the teacher, recasts with an emphatic stress to draw attention to the reformulated elements followed. Lyster (1998) on the other hand, has shown that the levels of repair in uptake following recasts are notably lower than those following more explicit types of feedback. Sheen (2004) corroborates in his study that repair occurred less frequently following recasts than explicit correction and metalinguistic feedback (Ellis et al 2006:342). In spite of the controversial results of different studies of CF, after analysing a number of studies, Russell and Spada (2006) reached the conclusion of supporting a beneficial role of CF in SLA (Ammar & Spada 2006:544) rather than excluding CF teaching a foreign language,

even though Krashen (1981) and Truscott (1999) have argued that CF should be abandoned because it can have potential negative effects on learners' affect, thus endangering the flow of communication. Lyddon (2011) agrees with the idea of not focusing on accuracy of form if the meaning is already clear. Furthermore, he suggests some errors being salient and not seriously disrupting communication (e.g. *he speak*, instead of the correct form *he speaks*) or not requiring any negotiation of meaning (Lyddon 2011:106). On the other hand, Lyddon's study (2011) shows that in all participating groups where different types of CF were used, improvements in target item accuracy were achieved. Moreover, Ammar and Spada (2006) affirm support for the claim that embedding CF in L2 teaching is more effective than participation in learning without getting any corrective feedback. They add that the potential benefit of any techniques of CF on L2 learning is dependent on the learners' proficiency level (Ammar & Spada 2006:562). According to the research by Ammar and Spada (2006), all high-proficiency learners seemed to benefit equally from recasts (e.g. recast, explicit correction) and prompts (e.g. clarification requests, metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, repetition) while low-proficiency learners who received recasts did not benefit as much as those who were pushed to self-correct. Ammar and Spada (2006) add that their latter findings confirm those of previous research of recasts (Mackey & Philp 1998, Netten 1991) and prompts (Lyster 2004, Nobuyoshi & Ellis 1993, Pica 1988). All in all, it is possible to conclude that CF has a rather beneficial role in L2 classroom.

1.2 Learner uptake

According to Lyster and Ranta (1997), learner uptake is a student's utterance that immediately follows the teacher's feedback that has an intention to draw student's attention to some aspect of student's initial utterance. It is clear for a student what the intention is, although the teacher's specific linguistic focus may not be. If the uptake does not take place, the topic continues either by the same or another student (the teacher's intention then goes

unheeded) or by the teacher (then the teacher has not provided an opportunity for uptake). Lyster and Ranta (1997) divide uptake into two categories: “repair” and “needs repair” and add that “...uptake in this sense is used as a way of evaluating the effectiveness of feedback types...” (Lyster & Ranta 1997:49). This definition shows that they have studied uptake only in relation to reactive focus on form, i.e. after a learner produces an erroneous utterance. However, some researchers question the utility of uptake, claiming that considering it as an indication of learning is not reliable (Long 2006, Ellis, Basturkmen & Loewen 2001). Ellis (2001) claim that uptake can also occur in pre-emptive focus on form, i.e. after they received information from the teacher or other learners. Thus, Ellis uses the terms of *successful* and *unsuccessful uptake* meaning that students either repairing or demonstrating an understanding of their erroneous utterances of the targeted linguistic form or making no attempt or failing in an attempt to repair an error or not clearly demonstrating an understanding of the targeted linguistic form.

In addition, Loewen (2004) explains that the production of uptake may indicate that a linguistic form has been noticed. That does not mean, however, that if a student fails to produce uptake, the linguistic form has not been noticed. Mackey and Philp (1998) add that “noticing/learning” is possible without the production of uptake. Nevertheless, Lightbown (1998), in her discussion of uptake, claims that “a reformulated utterance from the learner gives some reasons to believe that the mismatch between learner utterance and target utterance has been noticed, a step at least toward acquisition” (Loewen 2004:153). Consequently, uptake may be an indication that noticing has occurred, which in turn could more possibly lead students towards learning. In addition, Mackey and Oliver (2003) find in the results of the quasi-experimental study investigating the relationship between noticing of feedback and the development of question forms that the learners who reported more noticing developed significantly more than those whose reports suggested less noticing.

Assuming that noticing after corrective feedback occurs, embodied with a successful uptake, the question of which technique of CF evokes it more effectively still remains. The findings of the study by Lyster and Ranta (1997) show that while the recasts were most widely used CF, they were the least likely to lead to successful uptake. The early study of Slimiani (1992) demonstrates that around 30% of error corrections had passed unnoticed but they had occurred when the teacher reformulated learners' utterances implicitly without any meta-language or any further involvement of students (i.e. recasts). In contrast, he gave examples of the items students claimed as being noticed. Among these were the items that had arisen incidentally during the classroom interaction, targeted by more elicitive types of CF (Lyster et al 2002:578). Lyster's and Panova's (2002) study a decade later supports the results of Sliminani (1992) where over a half learners' erroneous utterances were followed by recasts and translations. Learner uptake appeared less than half of the times and only 16% of those uptake moves were followed of the feedback moves. Thus, as Loewen (2004) claims that the effectiveness of uptake pivots on a number of characteristics of feedback including: complexity, timing, and type of feedback. Hence, it is important to have a detailed study of the interaction between learners and the teacher while the teacher provides any type of corrective feedback. Using the approach of CA to analyse the interaction in the L2 classroom it is possible to follow the pauses, intonation and other detailed features of speech to get a better understanding of the factors influencing learner uptake.

1.3 Conversation Analysis (CA) approach compared to Second Language

Acquisition (SLA) approach

SLA and CA have different approaches to the concept of interaction. SLA is used as the umbrella term for language learning that occurs both in the contexts where the target language is and is not spoken outside the classroom. The analysis of classroom discourse focuses on the exchanges in which the teacher initiates, the learner responds, and the teacher

supplies feedback (also known as IRF) (Long 1990 cited in Ellis 1994). According to Ellis (1994), in SLA the main goal of research is characterize learners' underlying knowledge of the L2, i.e. to describe and explain their linguistic or communicative competence but actually the different kinds of performance used to investigate (e.g. analysing the learners' actual utterances, tapping learners' intuitions of what is correct and what is not or relying on the introspective and retrospective reports that learners provide about their own learning) do not provide a direct window to competence (Ellis 1994:13). The importance of social aspects during interaction is not mentioned. CA, on the other hand, is uniquely placed to examine the finest details of talk in interaction (Gardner 2012:229). As ten Have (1999) defines it, CA is a research tradition that grew out of ethnomethodology and studies the social organization of 'conversation', or 'talk-in-interaction', by a detailed inspection of tape recordings of naturally occurring talk, and transcriptions made from such recordings. The approach of CA can describe the sequencing of action and the organisation of turns at the micro level of verbal and nonverbal acts (Gardner 2012). The analysis includes, for example, the inspection of simultaneous, overlapping and contiguous utterances. Talk and interaction are examined as a site where intersubjective understanding (related to the understanding of the preceding turn displayed by the current speaker) concerning the participants' intentions, their state of knowledge, their relation, and their stance towards the talked-about objects is created, maintained, and negotiated (Atkinson and Heritage 1984: 11). The studies within the framework of CA explore the relationship between language structure, linguistic practices, and the organisation of turn taking and of sequences in talk in interaction (Seedhouse 2004). In addition, for CA, talk cannot be separated from its context; it is shaped by the context and the context is created and renewed through the talk (Atkinson & Heritage 1984). Interaction cannot be "...merely a factor consisting of the speaker's linguistic contribution, which can be

then controlled and manipulated”. Thus, any speech should be investigated as it is produced in interaction and its context and social environment need to be included (Kurhila 2006:10).

The concept of interaction in SLA has been challenged by the studies of conversation analysts (Firth & Wagner, 1997, Hall 1997, Mori 2004, Markee 2000, Kurhila 2006, etc.). They argue that SLA research on interaction does not take into account the social and contextual aspects of the language, focusing primarily on the cognition of learners and their linguistic contribution, which can be controlled and manipulated by the researchers. SLA mainstream research prioritises researcher-relevant concerns over participant-relevant ones, focusing more on examining occurrences of language form rather than on exploring interaction behaviours of learners and their ability to collaboratively construct the interaction. Additionally, according to Drew and Heritage (1992:7), much of SLA research on L2 interaction views the context as something static, fixed and concrete. In CA interaction is viewed from inside the system, with criteria chosen from within the system (Seedhouse 2005).

The most prominent characteristic of CA methodology is its emphasis on details. Gass (2003) points out that CA transcription includes very detailed information such as tempo increase, pitch, and volume, etc. Moreover, as the transcripts are based on the recordings, which in CA are considered the corpus, not the transcripts, the data could never be produced by the imagination of anybody (ten Have 1999). In fact, as Heritage (1984:241) explains, no details of interaction can be dismissed as accidental or irrelevant in CA. Gass (2003), on the other hand, argues that elaboration is not necessarily relevant to identify the understanding of learning. Despite the fact that some of the most prominent practitioners in mainstream SLA (e.g. Gass 1997; Long 1996) and including some of the practitioners of CA have expressed that CA is ill equipped to address issues of learning (He 2004 cited in Gardner 2008), CA has had a growing number on studies of second language talk and SLA (Gardner 2008:229). There are quite a few areas in SLA where CA appears to be useful: for example, studies on

recasts, input, Focus-on-Form Instruction (FFI) and oral language assessment (Markee 2000, Seedhouse 2004, He 2004). Also, supporting Markee's (2000) and other researchers' claim that cognition is not an individual but also a socially distributed cognition, Seedhouse (2004) points out that "CA is able to portray the progress of this socially distributed phenomenon and see what factors are involved in an individual's cognitive state in such a stream of interaction" (Seedhouse 2004:252). Kasper (2004) suggests researchers exploring more of CA methods to see what they might reveal about language learning and acquisition. Furthermore, as CA pays close attention to details of interaction, especially the sequencing of action, the composition and construction of turns and the temporal organisation of interaction at the micro level of verbal and nonverbal conduct, it is most able to address linguistic detail (Markee and Kasper 2004).

As for the interactional organisation in the L2 classroom setting, Seedhouse (2004) indicates to a reflective relationship between pedagogy and interaction: as the pedagogical focus varies, so does the organisation of interaction (turn-taking and sequence). He points out at three properties of classroom interaction: firstly, language is seen as both the vehicle and object of instruction. Secondly, the linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce will be linked in some way to the pedagogical purposes which the teacher introduces – teachers create L2 classroom context and shift from one context to another. This position is different from the mainstream SLA's approach, where interaction is considered as taking place in one static context. Thirdly, the linguistic forms and patterns of interaction which the learners produce are subject to evaluation by the teacher (Seedhouse 2004). These points are relevant as repair, including CF, is a fundamental part of interaction and a mechanism for dealing with problems related to achievement of shared understanding among the participants in interaction.

Although CA and SLA have different approaches to the concept of interaction, several researchers (e.g. Markee 2000, Seedhouse 2004, Mori 2004, Markee & Kasper 2004 etc.) suggest integrating an emic perspective, i.e. the participants' own perspective (Schegloff 1997) and social and contextual features of interaction that could be beneficial to SLA. Furthermore, Seedhouse (2004) mentions contributions which CA can make to SLA. For example, he proposes recasts as the area of collaboration between CA and SLA which are not necessarily just responses by the teacher to one student. In addition, Markee (2000) claims that cognition is not an individual but also a socially distributed cognition, Seedhouse points out that "CA is able to portray the progress of this socially distributed phenomenon and see what factors are involved in an individual's cognitive state in such a stream of interaction" (Seedhouse 2004:252).

Another contrast between CA and SLA is that the treatment of repair in CA has a broader meaning than correction in mainstream SLA terms (Wong & Waring 2010). Repair organisation offers all-inclusive and thus potentially more useful notions of the terms 'error' and 'correction', referring to all instances of problematic talk and the trajectories which are involved in its treatment. In order for repair to be relevant for participants, there must be the trouble-source i.e. a word, phrase, or utterance treated as problematic by the participants. The concept of repair is considered as an interactional process that involves an initiation, i.e. signalling or targeting a trouble source, and repair outcome, i.e. the solution to the trouble-source or abandonment of the problem. Repair can be initiated and completed in the same turn or across turns and it embodies a distinction between repair initiated and completed by the speaker who produced the trouble source or by others. (Wong & Waring 2010:213-214). Hence, four types are identified. According to Schegloff (1977), the types are as follows:

- self-initiated self-repair – both initiated and carried out by the speaker of trouble-source;

- other-initiated self-repair – carried out by the speaker of trouble-source but initiated by the recipient;

- self-initiated other-repair – the speaker of a trouble-source may try and get the recipient to repair the trouble;

- other-initiated other-repair – the recipient of a trouble-source turn both initiates and carries out the repair. This is closest to what is conventionally understood as ‘correction’ (Hutchby & Wooffitt 1998:61). According to Wong and Waring (2010:252), repair practices that address problems of comprehension and production in learning contexts and which are other-initiated by the teacher or peers in instructional contexts are called pedagogical repair. The pedagogical repair aims to facilitate the learning task and there are three features that make pedagogical repair different from repair in ordinary conversation: 1) learner turns as the location for trouble-source (a word, phrase or utterance treated as a problem by the participants); 2) ‘other’ comprising both teachers and peers; 3) varying repair trajectories by pedagogical context.

In mainstream SLA terms, the instructional correction (feedback) appears in the third turn and may include different types of CF, such as recasts, prompts, clarification requests etc. The trouble source, repair initiation and the repair proper precede the uptake, or reproduction of the corrected form by the speaker of the trouble source (Gardner & Wagner 2004).

The empirical part of the present thesis examines error correction, one of the common forms of repair in the language classroom. More specifically, it concentrates on the corrective feedback types used by the teacher; therefore, the terms of CF types, e.g. recast, elicitation, etc. are used instead of CA terminology, which has broader reference, not necessarily pedagogical. Nevertheless, in the transcripts, the conventions of CA’s system are used to make it possible to analyse the data as thoroughly as possible.

1.4. Focus-on-Form Instruction (FFI)

Seedhouse suggests that one point for concurrence between CA and SLA is FFI. He argues that the main focus of L2 teaching research should be on what actually happens in the classroom, that is focus-on-form instruction, rather than what is intended to happen (Seedhouse 2004:95).

The “instructional activities”, according to Ellis (2001), are intended to induce language learners to pay attention to linguistic form. In other words, “...form-focused instruction involves attempts to intervene directly in the process of interlanguage construction by drawing learners’ attention to or providing opportunities for them to practice specific linguistic features” (Ellis 2001:407). For example, when learners are asked to fill in a gap or choose a suitable form to complete a sentence, their attention is drawn to linguistic forms needed to perform the activity. In different publications (e.g. Ellis 2001:2) the term ‘form’ is intended to include phonological, lexical and pragmalinguistic aspects of language. According to Long and Robinson (1998), the term FFI is used to describe both approaches to teaching forms based on artificial syllabi, as well as more communicative approaches, where attention to form arises out of activities that are primarily meaning-focused. Ellis, Loewen and Basturkmen (2006) describe focus on form episodes as involving brief ‘time-outs’ from the attempt to communicate, “learners switch backwards and forwards from treating language as a tool for communication and functioning as language users to treating it as an object and functioning as teachers and learners” (Ellis et al 2006:137). Moreover, Doughty and Williams (1998) declare “it is likely that focus on form can enhance lexical acquisition. And there is mounting evidence that, in the acquisition of lexical items, as with that of grammatical structures, some interaction is helpful” (Doughty et al 1998:212). Paradowski (2007) has stated that focus on form acts as an intake or acquisition facilitator, helping the learners

perceive the feature under explanation in subsequent meaning-focused in which can then become intake.

Focus-on-meaning requires students to focus on the message being conveyed by the L2 (Doughty & Williams 1998). In other words, in focus-on-meaning context, learners have opportunities for expressing meanings with the focus on fluency rather than accuracy. As the focus is on establishing shared understanding and negotiating meaning, incorrect linguistic forms may be ignored in order to prevent disruption in the flow of interaction (Seedhouse 2004). In addition, meaning-based exposure to the language allows L2 learners to develop comprehension skills, oral fluency, self-confidence, and communicative abilities, but that they continue to have difficulties with pronunciation as well as with morphological, syntactic, and pragmatic features of the L2 (Harley & Swain 1984, Lyster 1987 cited in Lightbown & Spada 2006). Nevertheless, incorrect linguistic forms may be ignored in order to prevent disruption in the flow of interaction (Seedhouse 2004) if this is the aim.

In reality the interaction that occurs in the classroom is never just form-focused or meaning-focused, but a combination of both. When used together, these approaches can complement each other and enhance the language acquisition process for learners. Focus-on-form instruction is valuable because it provides a balanced model as it engages both learners and teachers to pay attention to form when needed, but within the tenets of the language classroom. Focus on form instruction may, however, be ineffective in developing vocabulary, particularly in advanced education levels. Moreover, as Smith (1993) points out, learning a simple item or pattern it is possible to achieve learners' divided attention (on both meaning and form), especially with more advanced learners, but the abstraction of more complex rules requires undivided attention. Van Patten (1994) investigated the ability of learners at different proficiency level to complete the task of identifying lexical items and comprehension at the same time. It occurred to be difficult for advanced learners but they could still attend both

parts of the task while lower-level learners could not do both kinds of processing simultaneously (Doughty & Williams 1998:249). Van Patten (1994) explains that the extent to which learners can process form and meaning together may be determined by the amount of knowledge that they have already acquired (cited in Doughty & Williams 1998:249). Furthermore, as all grammatical forms also have meanings behind them and the results of a study by Saeidi and Chong (2003) indicate that focus on form already provides learners with an understanding of the interdependence between grammar and communication. In other words, learners, while learning grammar, focus on three primary aspects of grammar: form, meaning, and use. As the current study also examines pre-intermediate level learners, it is important to focus on form.

CHAPTER II

2.1. Participants and Data

Using the approach of Conversation Analysis, the present master's thesis looks at sequences of classroom interaction among year 8 pre-intermediate students doing form-focused activities during English lessons at school. The participant group includes twenty-one pupils in an Estonian language state school in Tartu, Estonia. The students meet in their English classes three times per week as a part of their curriculum. They are at pre-intermediate level and their ages vary between fourteen and fifteen. The lessons are conducted mainly in English but with occasional use of explanations or comments in Estonian. One of the teachers participating has over eight years of experience working as an English teacher in elementary school (third year with this particular group) and is currently doing an MA degree on a teacher-training course. Another teacher participating has the experience of teaching only as a part of her MA degree teacher-training practice during the current academic year.

Before research procedures began, the students and their parents were informed that they were going to be audio recorded and gave their written consent to these recordings being utilised for the purpose of this research project.

The primary data consist of audio recorded teacher-student interaction. It was collected between November 2014 and February 2015 and contains 39 fragments of interaction where the use of CF was identified. The total length of the corpus is 210 minutes of recordings.

2.2. Methodology

The study is based on extracts from the corpus collected during oral correction of mistakes in classroom interactions and examines the feedback provided by the teacher and students' responses. The separate segments which represented particular strategies of

corrective feedback were transcribed in a line by line account of what was actually said in standard written orthography and analysed. The names appearing in the corpus have been changed according to the approach of CA preserving the syllable length and stress pattern. The analysis consists of contextual overviews and sequential analysis. Contextual overview provides such details as background information, corrective feedback strategies used to initiate the correction and the location of an error. The sequential analysis of excerpts includes turn-taking (simultaneous, overlapping and contiguous utterances), the duration of pauses between words of utterances, paralinguistic features (abrupt stops and elongations), prosodic features (stress, intonation, sound stretching), and also audible sounds which are not words such as breathiness and laughter. Completely incomprehensible words and utterances are transcribed by double parentheses, utterances that are not clearly heard and suggested guesses are transcribed with single open and close parentheses. The analysed interaction segments were transcribed using the conventions, abridged and adapted from Atkinson and Heritage, by N. Markee (see Appendix 1).

2.3. Analysis of the corpus

It is no easy task ranking different feedback types (such as recasts, metalinguistic feedback and explicit correction) according to their implicitness/explicitness. This difficulty with evaluating the implicitness/explicitness of feedback types, as well as some other theoretical concerns, have led several researchers (e.g. Ammar & Spada 2006, Ellis et al 2006, Lyddon 2011) to the classification of corrective feedback strategies into recasts and prompts. In this paper the same categorization is followed as the results of the current study reveal the teacher using roughly two types of approach to initiate the self-correction by learners. The teacher either prefers the error to be just identified and corrected without concentrating on the particular learner and his or her understanding of the mistake or she is determined to achieve

learners' self-correction. It may take more than one or two turns during the interaction between the teacher and a learner before the incorrect use of the target language is modified. Therefore, the teacher frequently uses different types of CF during the process of repair to guide a learner to self-correct. Thus, in the current paper, the first category of recasts includes two similar types (recast and explicit correction) of CF described by Lightbown and Spada (1990). They both provide learners with correct reformulation and therefore obviate the necessity to self-correct. Noticing more of the self-correcting force of the rest of feedback strategies (e.g. metalinguistic feedback, elicitation, clarification request), they are all joined and analysed under the category of prompts. The sixth type (repetition) according to Lyster and Ranta (1997) appeared in the corpus of the present study very rarely (twice) and only together with the use of some other type of CF. The particular excerpts in the present paper are chosen to demonstrate how each different type of CF appears in the real classroom interaction and the examples very well represent the collection of similar examples of each CF type in the current corpus. In addition, the excerpts where more than one type of CF is used by the teacher to elicit the error correction by student(s) are provided, as similar cases occur in the corpus frequently.

2.3.1. The use of recasts

The use of recasts, representing both strategies, explicit correction and recast, appeared in the data in general as a regular part of interaction. However, the frequency of using one of the types of recast was slightly lower in interactions carried out between students and the trainee teacher who was not familiar with the topic of CF in detail. The following examples (Examples 1, 2, 3 and 4) illustrate the CF types of recast:

Example 1

- 1 L1 I ate some cornflakes and uh: (0.2) dranked (.) some yoghurt
 2 T I drank, mhm.
 3 (0.7)
 4 T drank (0.1) the third sentence ((Kristina)) please

The student (L1) starts the utterance with a corrected target form (past simple of *eat*) and then pauses and continues with the stretched non-lexical perturbation (uh) and slightly pauses again before trying to provide another target form (the past simple form of the verb). The pause gave him some confidence and he finishes the sentence smoothly without realising the occurrence of an error. The teacher (T) notices the error and corrects it right after the student finishes the sentence without providing the elicitation to any self-correction. No learner uptake is evident at that point. Still, the teacher makes the pause (line 3) for the student to repeat the correct form but as there is still no reaction by the student, the teacher repeats the correct form herself once more and then continues with the next student. Hence, it is not possible to conclude whether any acknowledgement by the student occurs.

Example 2

- 1 T what did you do↑ this morning
 2 L1 (0.1) I sleep
 3 T =you slept
 4 LL //slept//
 5 L1 mhm.
 6 T (0.1) did you do anything else ↑
 7 L1 (0.1) no.
 8 T did you wake up ↑
 9 L1 (0.1) no.
 8 T =you didn't wake up ↑
 9 L1 no.
 10 T =you're still sleeping ↑

- 11 L1 (hhh)
 12 LL //(hhh)//
 13 T okay.-

The student's utterance as a response to the teacher's question after a slight pause is clear without any long hesitation of the target form or worrying to be mistaken. The teacher does not leave any pause either to let the student re-consider and modify his utterance but provides the correct form. Some other learners (LL) simultaneously provide the same correction of the occurred error. The student's short answer (mhm) may be just an agreement or confirmation that the form that should be there is "slept". The teacher continues asking questions probably hoping to find some more acknowledgement of using the past simple but the student keeps answering with a short stressed "no" hoping not to be obliged to provide any other forms as he seems to be concerned about providing an erroneous utterance. Finally, after the simultaneous slight laughter by other students the particular interaction is cut off by the teacher. It is difficult to interpret whether there was any acknowledgement by the student or not, even though the uptake occurred when saying "mhm".

Example 3

- 1 L1 he also going to visit-
 2 T = he's
 3 L1 (0.3) he's also going to visit some Tibetan people in their tents.

The student starts her utterance confidently without noticing an error but then suddenly cuts off to reconsider what was said. The teacher corrects the student without any pause by providing a correct form. The student, on the other hand, makes a slight pause for re-thinking of the correction and then repeats the correct form with a stress and without any hesitation and finishes the sentence fluently. From the student's stressed repetition it is possible to interpret the uptake and understanding of the misuse of the target form.

Example 4

- 1 T what time did you come to school.
 2 L1 I (0.2) come to school-
 3 T = I came-
 4 L1 I came to school (0.3) at half past eight =
 5 T mhm, okay.

This is another example of a clear case of recast, where the student hesitates before the utterance for a moment taking a short pause and then goes wrong in his utterance. As he cuts off in the middle of the sentence probably realising he should modify his utterance but the teacher does not wait for the reformulation or try to elicit student's self-correction. The teacher reformulates the erroneous form after the student's cut off immediately. It still results into the student's uptake and repetition of the correct form. In addition, the student then finishes the sentence taking another slight pause at the place where he hesitated before but then continues smoothly. Even though the student did not have a chance to self-correct and reconsider his utterance, it seems he was able to notice the problem that occurred and seemed to understand the reason and result of the correction provided by the teacher.

When learners receive feedback as recast on their erroneous output, they may react to it in different ways (uptake) or not react at all. According to examples in this study, the use of recasts as forms of CF leads to two different conclusions that are also argued in the related literature. According to the outcomes of different studies, recasts as CF strategies may have a set of limitations (e.g. Lyster & Ranta 1997, Lyster & Panova 2002) or on the contrary, they may be considered important and effective in L2 teaching (e.g. Long 2006). It is very difficult to estimate whether in Example 1 the repair by the teacher was even noticeable for the student and in Example 2 the student's reaction did not provide enough information about the understanding of the target form. Therefore, as some researchers (e.g. Lyster 1998, Lyster & Ranta 1997) believe, recasts are not facilitative for L2 development or due to its ambiguous

nature recasts may be perceived as synonymous in function to mere repetition for language learners. On the other hand, despite these limitations, recasts often appear in the meaningful communicative activities where interlocutors share a “joint attentional focus” (Long 2006:114). Moreover, due to the reactive nature recasts do not impede the flow of communication, which actually can be also seen in Example 2. In Examples 3 and 4 the use of recast helps the student quickly to realise his ill-formed utterance and after a short consideration repeat the corrected form by being able to continue the cut off sentence.

2.3.2. The use of prompts

The teacher and the trainee teacher both used several types of prompts. In some cases there was clear use of clarifications, elicitations or metalinguistic feedback but it appeared that the combination of CF was also regularly used by the teachers. Using two or more different types of CF during one interactional situation was mainly elicited when the first type provided did not result in self-correction by the student. It seemed that when the teacher had already started providing feedback with the aim of guiding the student to the self-correction, she was determined to reach the anticipated result. Moreover, it sometimes occurred that learners produced more than one ill-formed utterance during one interaction or when one error was corrected, the next one appeared. Situations like these also evoked the teacher to use different types of CF. Examples of combinations of CF types and clear cases of different types of prompts will be analysed separately. Repetition as a feedback type was used very rarely by both of the teachers. Even so, all the other varieties of prompts mentioned above were more or less equally the part of the teacher’s provided feedback.

The following examples (Example 5,6,7) demonstrate the use of clarification requests which were slightly more often used than the other types or used as the first choice as feedback.

Example 5

- 1 L1 this book was (0.2) ◦((unintelligible)) in 2007 ◦ =
 2 T = I'm sorry (0.1) what did you say
 3 L1 (0.1) this book was written
 4 T written (0.1) right.

The teacher uses the phrase “I’m sorry” and to make sure what she expects from the student, adds a question “what did you say”. As the transcript demonstrates, the target form was probably already unintelligible while it was uttered but as there is a slight pause and decreased volume in the student’s utterance before he produces the target form, there is a reason to believe he was not sure of the correct form himself and therefore it may have been defective. The teacher’s clarification request gave the student an opportunity to reassert himself and after another short pause he produced a correct target form adding some stress to it while saying to demonstrate he actually knows it.

Example 6

- 1 L1 we (0.1) have arr[ei]- (0.1) arr[ein]- ◦arrange- //huh?//◦=
 2 T = could you speak up please,
 3 L2 //arranged//
 4 L1 we have arranged to: =
 5 T = right

The student first initiates repair by repeating the beginning of the target form (past participle of a regular verb) but she does not finish the sentence as she realises she is not right and decreases the volume producing a perturbation sound (huh). At the same time, the teacher already realises the student’s hesitation of the target form and that she is not able to finish it. Then the teacher, instead of informing the student of being wrong or correcting the form herself, asks the student to speak up. The request actually means the request to try to modify the uttered form. The first student uptake then comes from another student who

simultaneously provides the expected form. That utterance, by another learner, elicits the uptake for the first learner who repeats the modified phrase correctly.

Clarification requests in general do not point out the exact item in a sentence or an utterance where the error occurred. The questions or remarks (e.g. Sorry, Could you repeat that, please, etc.) often indicate as if the speaker / learner was not heard by the teacher but most of the times it seems to be quite clear for the students that such a request actually means the need for something to be reformulated even though the opportunity to find out the exact error is not provided. On the other hand, for learners at lower proficiency levels can only notice there is something wrong in their production, but the clarification requests may not elicit successful repair. The following example (Example 7) demonstrates how the clarification does not instantly help the student to self-correct.

Example 7

- | | |
|-------|--|
| 1 L1 | she's really upset because her bicycle (0.1) steal (0.5) a:: (0.1) was steal- |
| 2 T | = could you repeat please |
| 3 L1 | she's really upset because her bicycle was stole- |
| 4 T | did you say was sto:: - |
| 5 L1 | ◦stole◦ |
| 6 T | I couldn't really hear the end of the word (0.2) could say the verb form once again (0.3) the bicycle was- |
| 7 L1 | was steal- (0.1) stoled |
| 8 T | what are the three forms of steal= |
| 10 LL | = //steal stole stolen//= |
| 11 T | = so (0.3) the bicycle: - |
| 12 L1 | was stolen. |
| 13 T | right. good. |

During several turn-takings the teacher uses clarification requests to try to initiate the error correction by the student. When beginning the sentence, the student seems to be uncertain of the target form as he is hesitant (line 1) and makes a short pause before providing

the form. After the utterance (steal) he makes another, longer pause realising the ill-formed utterance himself and reformulating it (was steal) but still fails to produce a correct form and cuts off. As the teacher senses that the student has realised the occurrence of an error, she uses the clarification request (line 2) to provide the student the opportunity to modify his utterance once more. The student, on the other hand, probably interprets the teacher's request as mishearing or not hearing as he just repeats his previous sentence unchanged. Therefore, similar scenario between the teacher and the student continues for four turns. As eventually, the student realises he needs to change the form of the verb in passive (stole), he suggests the ending "ed" being unconfident, as the preceded cut off and pause demonstrate, of whether the verb actually is regular or irregular (line 7). At this point the teacher realises the student's incapability to self-correct the particular form without any further help and thus turns to metalinguistic question after which other students intervene providing the correct past participle of steal. Immediately the teacher once more tries to elicit the first student to provide the target form. With the assistance proposed the student eventually produces the correct form. The final guidance by the teacher contained the use of one more type of CF called elicitation.

Moreover, elicitation is claimed to be more supportive way of feedback for lower level learners (Ammar 2003), where the teacher prompts or asks a question to draw the correct form from the student without actually demonstrating it or may begin a form for the student to complete, or may ask a question such as "What is the (x) form of (y)?" that provides clearer idea for learners about the error and its position.

Example 8

- | | |
|------|------------------------------------|
| 1 T | <u>how</u> did you come to school, |
| 2 L1 | (0.2) I come to school by car |
| 3 T | I::↑ |

4 L1 = I came to school by car.

5 T okay.

The teacher's stretched word (I::) with a rising tone clearly identifies the part of the utterance that she expects the student to modify. At first the student might have either misinterpreted the teacher's question being in the past or just accidentally mispronounced the past simple form. But as soon as the teacher draws his attention to the beginning of his utterance, he realises what the target form should be and is able to self-correct without any hesitation.

Example 9

1 L1 he lives there for two years and he loves it.

2 T alright. for two years, (0,2) so he:: =

3 LL = //has// =

4 L2? = has lived

The student started the sentence with a wrong tense form selection (present simple) but did not realise it and continues the sentence smoothly until the end. In this example, the teacher first points out the key words to demonstrate the need for repair and then stretches the word (he::) that should follow the reformulated target form. This time other students intervene to provide the missing auxiliary (of present perfect tense). As this does not still complete the whole repair, another student provides the correction without any pauses. Therefore, as peer-intervention was immediate, it is unclear whether the first student who started the utterance inaccurately would have been able to self-correct. Nevertheless, the teacher's feedback led to the correction of ill-formed construction.

These examples show that it is easier for learners to notice the need for repair when the position of the occurred error is clear. In this case finding the way for correction does not take too long and thus does not interfere with the general flow of conversation. However, if

the teacher's aim is to give a deeper level of understanding of necessary repair and entailing longer time-outs during the interaction, metalinguistic feedback is used.

The following example (Example 10) demonstrates how the teacher uses metalinguistic comments to help to guide the student to an understanding of her error and its repair.

Example 10

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1 L1 | next week we will see the (..) U2 live, we've bought the tickets |
| 2 T | <u>next</u> week- |
| 3 L1 | we will going to see- |
| 4 T | so what do you think (.) if this is a concert (..) and I'm <u>talking</u> about my plans about it, is it something I've decided before or I have <u>just</u> decided |
| 5 L1 | before |
| 6 T | so, (0.3) if it's done before, (0.1) you need what ↑ |
| 7 L1 | we're going to see. |
| 8 T | right. Okay. (0.2) did you understand why ↑ |
| 9 L1 | yes. |
| 10 T | okay. |

At first the student starts the sentence smoothly providing the future simple form which is probably derived from the beginning (next week) that refers to the future. The following pause may be interpreted as a hesitation of what was just produced or of the following word (U2, the name of the band) that the student may not be familiar with. The teacher's stressed repetition of the key words (next week) makes the student to realise that there is something wrong with her target form and remembers that there has to be another option. She still fails to produce a correct target form and cuts off right after the ill-formed phrase (will going to see). The teacher continues with comments to lead the student to the realisation of which the correct form needs to be. So, it includes three turns (lines 4, 5 and 6) after which the student is able to produce the correct form. As the student was able to answer the teacher's question (line 4) and after the teacher's next question (line 6) the student did not

provide the answer but already produced the target form, it is possible to assume that she had already reached to the accurate understanding of which form and why was needed in the particular sentence. In addition, the teacher wants to reassure the student's acknowledgement by asking about it (line 8) and the student confirms with a confident "yes" (line 9).

Example 11.

- 1 L1 Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets (filled) ((unintelligible))
- 2 T you need two words in the gap.
- 3 L1 (.) a:h, were filled (0.1) ei was filled
- 4 T okay.

In the first line the student may misread or misunderstand the second half of the sentence and therefore fail to fill in the gap properly. As soon as the teacher provides the information about the construction needed it helps the student to realise the problem. After a moment he utters two words as the teacher had suggested but then pauses for a moment. After the short reconsidering he comes to the conclusion he still failed to produce completely accurate form (past simple passive in singular), confirms it with "ei" (no) in Estonian and manages to self-correct. Thus, the teacher's information about the construction of the form helped the student enough to realise what needed to be changed in order to produce the target form.

Furthermore, the metalinguistic clues may be also presented as questions to help learners reach the self-correction.

Example 12

- 1 L1 when were first television picture produced
- 2 T television picture. (0.1) is it singular or plural
- 3 LL //singular//
- 4 T singular! (0.1) what do you need to use then if the word's in singular
- 5 L1 maybe wa::s (0.1) was-

- 6 T right (0.2) so can you form the question once more now please
 7 L1 when was the first television picture produced
 8 T okay.

The student completes the whole sentence (question line 1) confidently and does not notice the error that appears in past simple passive form (singular / plural). Instead of just correcting the plural form the teacher repeats the preceding nouns and after a short pause adds a question to make the questionable form more clear for the student. It initiates the student to produce the correct target form instantly but he is able to provide the correct answer to the teacher's question. To confirm the correctness of the answer, the teacher repeats it and adds another question about the target form to help the student forward. Again, the student does not feel confident enough to complete the past simple passive in singular but gives an answer; at first hesitantly by stretching the word (wa::s) but then confirming it once more but cutting then off. As the teacher realises the continuing hesitation of the student, she once more asks the student to utter the full sentence with the correct target form. As for now, the student has got enough affirmation from the teacher, he smoothly repeats the initial sentence accurately.

The use of metalinguistic clues may be sometimes more time-consuming in a class compared to recasts, for example, but it definitely encourages learners to produce their own target-like output and additionally provides the deeper understanding of the repair conducted.

In addition to the cases where using one method of CF by the teacher was enough most of the times to elicit student's self-correction, there frequently appeared situations where the teacher found it necessary to implement more than one type of CF alternately. All these situations included some metalinguistic clues and then either clarification requests, elicitation, repetition or explicit correction. The following excerpts illustrate the use of different types of CF after one another to push the student to self-correct.

Example 13

- | | |
|------|--|
| 1 L1 | I didn't know (who men) were- |
| 2 T | = could you repeat the fifth gap once more as I didn't catch what you said |
| 3 L1 | (0.5) zero article |
| 4 T | I didn't know who men were ↑ (0.5) have we spoken about these men before |
| 5 L1 | oh:, yeah (0.1) <u>the</u> |
| 6 T | so, the:: |
| 7 L1 | (0.5) <u>the men</u> were |
| 8 T | right. |

The student starts his utterance without uncertainty but still cuts off after having failed to provide the target form (definite article). The teacher promptly carries on with a clarification request to make sure whether there really appeared an error and the student's cut off could be interpreted as his own realisation of an ill-formed utterance. After a short consideration the student repeats his use of incorrect zero article. Thereafter, the teacher uses another CF type to attempt the student to acknowledge the occurred mistake. So, the teacher repeats the student's incorrect sentence with a slight raise of voice and a pause after the utterance referring to the occurred error. As there is no reaction by the student the teacher continues with providing a metalinguistic question hoping for the student to identify the position of an error. The student's response (oh, yeah) clearly indicates that the teacher's previous attempts (clarification request and repetition) to initiate the correction were not enough for the student to realise the occurrence of an error but as soon as the right indicator (metalinguistic question) was provided he instantly became aware of the failure and was able to correct it. Hence, the successful teacher-initiated student-repair may greatly depend on the teacher's choice of the type of CF.

The following example, on the contrary, demonstrates that sometimes the teacher's choice of CF types does not lead the student's self-correction.

Example 14

- 1 L1 I don't want to do my English homework now, I think I'm going to do it tomorrow instead
- 2 T (...) what did you say, I::
- 3 L1 I'm going-
- 4 T but it's right now, you decided right now (...) you don't want to do it right now so you decide now that (...) you'll do it tomorrow (...)
- 5 L1 hhh
- 6 LL //(cough)// //laughter//
- 7 T okay, it's will (0.1) as you decide now
- 8 (0.2)
- 9 T Okay (0.1) I'm giving you some grammar sheets to practice some more

The student reads out the sentence smoothly and without any hesitation. The teacher starts with a clarification request without directly emphasising there has been an error in the student's utterance but instead asking the student to repeat his utterance (what did you say). Although the teacher adds a short form of fragment of elicitation (I::) to signal the location of an error, the student, similarly as in Example 13, interprets the teacher's request as mishearing and repeats the already used form (I'm going). Realising that the student did not identify the occurrence of a trouble in his utterance the teacher clues the student with metalinguistic information providing short pauses for the student to intervene. As the student still fails to acknowledge the problem with the target form (future simple) the teacher decides to use recast as the next CF type but also emphasising the reason for the need for the provided form (will) once more (as you decide right now). Subsequently, the teacher leaves a short pause for learner uptake before continuing but no uptake emerges.

In the following example the teacher provides metalinguistic information and a metalinguistic question alternately adding elicitation. Also other students intervene to help with the correction but when the target form is achieved another error in the same sentence appears.

Example 15

- 1 L1 e::rm (0.1) He laughs so much when he (0.2) when the clown doctor's here. a:: (0.1) James had three (0.3) e: (0.1) ((coughs)) -
- 2 T = you have to use present perfect.
- 3 L1 e: (..)
- 4 T what does it consist of, (0.2) you have to use an auxiliary verb and the past participle of have.
- 5 L1 (...)
- 6 T he::
- 7 L1 (0.2) °he:°(0.5)
- 8 T he:: (0.1) talon olnud
- 9 L2 he have had.
- 10 T he:::↑
- 11 LL //he has had//
- 12 L3 he has had three operations.
- 13 LL //he has had three operations// //he have had-//
- 14 T I heard two different versions, which is right ↑
- 15 L1 has had =
- 16 T = go on
- 17 L1 James has had three operations [s ai n c] last month.
- 18 T what is the word before last month ↑
- 19 L1 m::: =
- 20 T = has had three operations,
- 21 L1 since
- 22 T since (0.1) yes (0.1) do you know what it means↑
- 23 L1 e:: (0.2) alates =
- 24 T = yes, (0.1) alates eelmissesst kuust. right.

In this example, the student pauses already before reading out the beginning of the sentence. He then misreads but self-corrects and continues hesitantly by pausing twice before the target form but still providing a tense form, past simple (had) instead of present perfect. Having probably realised his own failure the student pauses shortly once more, coughs and then cuts off even though the sentence continues. The teacher instantly provides some metalinguistic information to push the student to modify his ill-formed utterance. In line 3, the

student's reaction as lengthened "e" sound and a following pause, illustrate student's lack of knowledge of present perfect as a term. Thus, the teacher proceeds with a metalinguistic question (line 4) but as there appears no instant response by the student, the teacher herself carries on with some more information about the form. However, there is still no response by the student and at this point, it could be possible to infer that the student is not capable of rephrasing his erroneous utterance. The teacher uses another type of CF, elicitation for several times to first help the student to locate the error and then using Estonian for more guidance (lines 6 and 8). At this instance other student(s) intervene by providing present perfect form but still failing with the third person singular, which is corrected after the teacher once more uses elicitation emphasising the third person singular with the rise of intonation (line 10). As now several students respond simultaneously, the teacher asks for clarification so that someone would confirm the correct form. For now, the first student has been able to identify the target form and repeats it himself (line 15). As he is asked to continue the unfinished sentence, he continues smoothly but mispronounces the word "since" (line 17). It takes the teacher two more turns to help the student reach the self-correction but eventually he is able to produce it and for teacher's confirmation he manages to present the meaning of this particular word. The teacher, in turn, verifies the correctness of the student's response.

Multiple turns between the teacher and student(s) to complete or correct just one sentence is rather time-consuming and may arise a question whether it is necessary and will not cause the boredom or scattering of thoughts. This particular interaction reveals that other students follow the conversation with the teacher and provide help when the first student still seems to be struggling with the target form after the teacher's repeated CF. Moreover, despite the permanent hesitancy and uncertainty the first student still follows the whole process and is finally able to achieve the expected result. Therefore, when the aim is to acknowledge a

certain form, the use of prompts as CF by the teacher seems to be justified although it may be time-consuming.

2.4. Discussion

This study was motivated by contradictory standpoints in error correction and the role of CF in L2 classroom. Even though the followers of nativist paradigm suggest using positive feedback instead of negative (e.g. Gass 2003), other researchers (e.g. Ellis 2006, Saxton 1997, White 1991, Carroll & Swain 1993, Lyster & Saito 2010, Lyster 2007, Farrar 1992) advocate error correction and CF as a significant part of a L2 teaching process. Moreover, according to Sheen (2010), one of the advantages of oral CF is that it is provided immediately after the erroneous utterance and therefore it is an opportunity for the whole class to get involved in the learning process. The theory that learning happens through correction is supported by many researchers (e.g. Carroll & Merrill 1993, Doughty & Varela 1998, Iwashita 2003, Lyster 2001, Lyster & Ranta 1997, etc.).

In addition, there has been a discussion of which CF strategies are more productive in terms of managing interaction and language acquisition. In light of this debate, the aim of the present study is, at first, to identify which types of CF are most commonly used in one lower-intermediate L2 classroom in Estonia, as there is very little research conducted in the field. Secondly, the aim is to find out whether any of the CF strategies appears to be more productive in terms of managing interaction and language acquisition.

The present study investigating two teachers, a trainee teacher and an experienced teacher, working with the same learners' group alternately, revealed them both using different strategies of CF. However, the use of prompts outnumbered the use of recasts, which is contrary to Lyster and Ranta's study (1997). The trainee teacher used explicit correction or a recast slightly more frequently than the experienced teacher and her use of different CF types

varied less. It can be explained with the following reasons: the trainee teacher was not familiar with the topic of CF strategies while the other teacher was, she had had the previous experience of teaching only for a few classes and had only the theoretical background of pedagogy. Furthermore, during the recording period there were fewer classes given by the trainee teacher than by the other teacher. Despite these facts, the use of all six types of CF (by Lyster & Ranta 1997) is represented, although the model of repetition was surprisingly rarely used. This finding was unanticipated as the critical analysis of the recordings generates the view of repetition as a valuable tool for pointing out a trouble source for students.

In the study, while analysing the cases of different CF strategies, one feature – learner uptake, whether it appeared or not, was observed and if the type of CF used had any effect on it. Within all the data, there was only one case where there was no learner uptake (Example 1) evident. The teacher used a recast as a CF and after realising the student was not going to repeat the target form, she provided the continuation of the topic without eliciting any further response from the student. The explanation here may be that the teacher found the topic continuation more important as it included similar target forms (using past simple) and the particular student was then able to get engaged and acknowledge the same topic thereafter. According to Lyster and Ranta's (1997) study, recast and explicit correction are the least likely types of CF to lead to learner uptake. All the other types, clarification requests, elicitation, metalinguistic feedback and repetition are more successful in terms of evoking learner uptake. Nevertheless, the present study did not witness a great difference in relation to CF type provided by the teacher and learner uptake. However, the use of prompts seemed to have greater effect on pushing students to self-correct. Hence, it enhanced students' formulation and comprehension of target forms in a certain context. In addition, in the course of teacher-initiated self-correction (an)other student(s) joined in with the process of repair. Furthermore, in the corpus there appeared a few cases of the teacher-initiated student

correction, which helps the whole class stay concentrated on the topic being relevant at this particular moment.

The teacher's straightforward initiation for students to correct each other, which appeared surprisingly infrequently in the corpus of the present study, is a trajectory that only occurs in form-focused contexts and may be a context-specific repair trajectory (Seedhouse 2004). The choice of this trajectory in this context is also justified by Edge (1989), who presented four main statements as the advantages of this pedagogical technique. Briefly, when the learner fails to provide the correct answer, and (an)other learner(s) correct(s) it, they are all involved in the process of correction and thinking about the form. While they do that, the teacher gets invaluable information about the students' ability as well as a wide variety of other important factors contributing to their individual learning styles, e.g. how self-confident or shy they appear to be. Lastly, in accomplishing correction collaboratively learners see that learning is a socially shared process.

Notably, in this study, in the case of hesitation whether the target form is correct, an immediate cut-off by the student appeared. It was never left unnoticed by the teacher. Instead, an immediate attention was provided including some of the CF strategies. And as Sheen (2010) adds, the advantage of oral CF is that it is provided immediately after the erroneous utterance. That makes it more likely to result in uptake and elicit response.

In addition, as witnessed in the results, the teacher was commonly eager to achieve students' self-correction and therefore provided and experimented with different types of oral CF. Thus, other students frequently became engaged and a successful repair was reached in most cases. The positive influence of CF, as mentioned above, was especially recognized when using any of the strategies of prompts. Although the use of metalinguage or other forms of CF that do not directly point out the error may have been more time-consuming compared to recasts, it definitely supported the error acknowledgment and correction accomplishment.

Another discovery was that the teacher put extra effort into dealing with students with considerably less knowledge of the expected target forms. For example, when using metalanguage or elicitation was not helpful enough, the teacher provided the guidance using mother tongue. This, in turn, supported students' confidence of exertion. Another explanation here could be high motivation of students and a friendly relationship with the teacher that could be observed in the recordings of this particular group. Therefore, these findings may not be relevant to students in different circumstances – other classrooms – where participants are more reticent in L2 learning and/or less motivated and as a result show far less interest in collaboratively accomplishing correction of errors. Nevertheless, positive teacher-student relationships enable students to feel safe and secure in their learning environments and provide scaffolding for the development of important social and academic skills (Baker et al 2008).

One more remarkable finding of the study was the teacher's confirmation of students' completed correction. It was specifically interesting to hear how much echoing was being used once correction has been accomplished, believing it to be necessary to ensure all students had heard and understood the answer. Furthermore, in some cases, besides confirming the student's modification of an erroneous utterance was correct, the teacher wanted to make sure student(s) had understood the reason for a particular form being used by asking or adding compatible comments. On one hand, it is another example of how students are provided with the opportunity to learn from others' error correction. On the other hand, it also demonstrates the teacher's willingness to acknowledge the students' success in error correction.

Examining the organisation of repair within form-focused context, paying special attention to repair trajectories and correction types should help teachers to be more analytical about the correction strategies they use in their daily routines. To understand how students accomplish repair is crucial because, as Seedhouse puts it, "...in the L2 classroom setting tends

to carry a heavier load than in other settings” (Seedhouse 2004:34). Every classroom is unique, and to understand how teachers and learners co-construct their interaction in one real classroom should be in the interest of any practitioner. Making audio recordings of classroom interaction (with participants’ consent) and analysing and interpreting them may be of significant utility in any language teacher’s action research.

The analysis of the tapescripts evoked a critical self-analysis of the teacher and some changes in classroom management strategies were carried out to increase more students’ involvement in each other’s error correction. Furthermore, the aim for the teacher was to vary the use of CF strategies more taking each student’s proficiency level and personality into consideration to support and elicit students’ own repair. Now, several months after concluding the recordings, the classroom discourse has changed: the teacher’s intention to initiate students to correct each other has led to greater involvement of students and at the same time they are quieter and more supportive with each other. In addition, the teacher uses CF strategies with a greater awareness concentrating more on each individual student or situation.

CONCLUSION

The aim of this single case analysis was to explore in detail how error correction is organised and in particular which CF strategies are used in L2 classroom in a form-focused context as the pedagogical goal in these particular classes are linguistically correct utterances. An approach of Conversation Analysis enables a detailed examination of classroom interaction that has been recorded.

The debates regarding the relative efficacy of different CF strategies have motivated a number of experimental studies. The outcomes, still, have provided the researchers with controversial conclusions. Therefore, it is difficult for teachers to decide which strategies to use. Ellis (2006) suggests it might be possible to identify those oral CF strategies that can generally be considered the most effective, but caveats will inevitably arise as to whether they will prove the most effective with all learners in all contexts. On the other hand, teachers often may even not concentrate on the issue which oral CF strategies they themselves are using daily in their classrooms and whether any of these strategies may have some more effect than the others in different situations or with different students. Thus, it is important for researchers to conduct studies on CF and the teachers to be aware of them to encourage themselves into self-analysis and to consider the whole range of CF techniques.

The analysis of this study has shown that the teacher initiated repair using all six different types of CF was a natural part of this particular classroom interaction. However, different methods and the frequency of using either recasts or prompts differed between the experienced teacher who was aware of the topic of CF and the trainee teacher. The use of prompts was slightly less frequent and less varied by the trainee teacher who was less familiar with the background information on CF.

The analysis of the data, on the other hand, revealed the support for students' realisation of the need to modify their erroneous utterances. The use of metalanguage by the

teacher kept students engaged until the positive result, self-correction, was accomplished. This supports previous findings on CF: the idea that using prompts may prove to be more effective in lower-proficiency level in terms of managing classroom interaction and acknowledgement of a particular form.

Furthermore, in some cases, other students got involved in the process of correction, which also helped to reach the positive result without the teacher providing the target form herself. Thus, the teacher should even more encourage other students to be the initiators of other's repair and jointly manage the whole interaction instead of letting the teacher be in full control of everything in the classroom.

Therefore, CF provides teachers in L2 classrooms with pedagogical advice to maximize the effect of error correction, all of which have made research on recasts and prompts an issue of intensive enquiry. Further research using the same approach could be used to add data from real classroom interaction and thus help to use different types of CF more effectively. In addition, research among practicing teachers and about their awareness of error correction strategies could be carried out to draw their attention to this topic.

In any language learning classroom, teachers are the one who takes the most responsibility in the success or failure of students. Teachers, then, are the backbone of language learning process without whom the process will not even take off. For that reason, a good language learning classroom needs a great teacher who among other things is aware of CF strategies and is able to successfully accommodate these strategies to his/her classroom.

REFERENCES:

- Allwright, Dick and Kathleen M. Bailey. 1991. Focus on the language classroom: introduction to classroom research for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ammar, Ahlem. 2003. Implicit versus Explicit Feedback in Classroom: An Experimental Study. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3, 439-445.
- Ammar, Ahlem and Nina Spada. 2006. One size fits all? Recasts, prompts and L2 learning. *Studies Second Language Acquisition*, 28, 543-574.
- Atkinson, J. Maxwell and Heritage, John. 1984. *Structures of Social Action: Studies in Conversation Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baker, Colin and Sylvia P. Jones. 1998. *Encyclopedia of Bilingualism and Bilingual Education*, 503. China: Imago.
- Baker, Jean A., Grant, Sycarahand and Larissa Morlock. 2008. The teacher–student relationships a developmental context for children with internalizing or externalizing behaviour problems. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23, 1, 3-15.
- Brown, Douglas. 2000. *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. New York: Longman.
- Carroll, Susanne and Merrill Swain. 1993. Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 357-386.
- CEFR=Common European Framework of References for Languages. 2001. Council of Europe. Strasbourg.
- Chaudron, C. 1988. Second language classrooms: Research on teaching and learning. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. New Horizons in the Study of Language and Mind. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chu, Ruili. 2011. Effects of Teacher’s Corrective Feedback on Accuracy in the Oral English of English Majors College Students. *Academy Publisher. Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, Vol. 1, 5, 454-459
- Corder, S. Pit. 1991. *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Drew, Paul and John Heritage. 1992. *Talk at work: interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Doughty, Cathrine. 2001. Instructed SLA: Constraints, compensation, and enhancement. In C. Doughty and M. Long (eds.) *Handbook of second language acquisition*. New York: Blackwell.
- Doughty, Catherine and Jessica Williams. 1998. *Focus on Form in Classroom Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge University Press: New York
- Doughty, Catherine and Elisabeth Varela. 1998. Communicative focus on form. In C. Doughty and J. Williams (eds.). *Focus on form in classroom language acquisition*, 114-138. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Edge, Julian. 1989. *Mistakes and correction* London: Longman.

- Ellis, Rod. 1994. *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Ellis, Rod. 2001. Introduction: Investigating form-focused instruction. *Language Learning*, 51:1, 1-46.
- Ellis, Rod. 2002 Does form-focused instruction affects the acquisition of implicit knowledge? A Review of the Research. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 24:02, 223-236.
- Ellis, Rod. 2009. Corrective Feedback and Teacher Development. *L2 Journal*. 1, 3-18.
- Ellis, Rod, Helen Basturkmen and Shawn Loewen. 2001. Learner uptake in communicative ESL lessons. *Language Learning*. 51, 281-318.
- Ellis, Rod, Shawn Loewen and Rosemary Erlam. 2006. Implicit and explicit corrective feedback and the acquisition of L2 grammar. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 28, 339-368.
- Ellis, Rod and Young Sheen. 2006. Re-examining the role of recasts in second language acquisition. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 28, 575-600.
- Evntskaya, Natalia. 2012. Conversation Analysis for Second Language Acquisition and beyond: An interview with Numa P. Markee. *Bellaterra Journal of Teaching & Literature* 5 (3), 57-65.
- Farrar, Michael J. 1992. *Negative evidence and grammatical morpheme acquisition*. *Developmental Psychology*. 28, 90-98.
- Fatemi, Azar H. 2014. The Impact of Recast versus Prompts on the Grammatical Accuracy of Iranian EFL Learners' Speech. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4:3, 532-543.
- Firth, Alan and Johannes Wagner. 1997. On Discourse, Communication, and (some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81:3, 285-300.
- Gardner, Rod. 2008. *Conversation Analysis. The Handbook of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Gardner, Rod. 2012. *Conversation Analysis in the Classroom* in *The Handbook of Conversation Analysis*. Eds. J. Sidnell and T. Stivers, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK
- Gardner, Rod and Johannes Wagner (eds.). 2004. *Second language conversations*. London: Continuum.
- Gass, Susan M. 1997. *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gass, Susan M. 2003. Input and interaction, In C. J. Doughty, M. L Long (eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Gass, Susan and Larry Selinker. 2008. *Second Language Acquisition: An introductory course*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Hall, Joan. 1997. A Consideration of SLA as a Theory of Practice: A Response to Firth and Wagner. *The Modern Language Journal*, 81:3, 301-306.
- ten Have (1999). *Doing Conversation Analysis. A practical guide*. SAGE Publications. London, Thousand Oaks. New Delhi.

- He, Agnes W. (2004). CA for SLA: Arguments from the Chinese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88: 4, 568-582.
- Hendrickson, James M. 1978. Error correction in foreign language teaching: Recent theory, research, and practice. *Modern Language Journal*. 62: 387-398.
- Hutchby, Ian and Robin Wooffitt. 1998. *Conversation Analysis. Principles, practices and applications*. Polity.
- Iwashita, Noriko. 2003. Negative feedback and positive evidence in task-based interaction: Differential effects of L2 development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 25, 1-36.
- Kasper, Gabriele. 2004. Participant Orientations in German Conversation-for-Learning. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88: 551-567.
- Kazuya, Saito and Roy Lyster. 2010. Oral feedback in classroom SLA: A meta-analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 32, 265-302.
- DeKeyser, Robert. 1993. The effect of error correction on grammar knowledge and grammar proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 501-514.
- Krashen, Stephen D. 1981. *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. Pergamon Press Inc.
- Kurhila, Salla. 2006. *Second Language Interaction*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lightbown, Patsy M. and Nina Spada. 1990. Focus-on-form and corrective feedback in communicative language teaching: effects on second language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 429-448.
- Lightbown, Patsy. M., and Nina Spada. 2006. *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford:Oxford University Press.
- Lightbown, Patsy M. 1998. The importance of timing in focus on form. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, Michael. 1996. The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Handbook of second language acquisition*.
- Long, Michael. 2006. *Problems in SLA*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Long, Michael and Robinson, P. 1998. Focus on form: Theory, research, and practice. In C. Doughty & J. Williams (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loewen, Susan. 2004. Uptake in incidental focus on form in meaning-focused ESL lessons. *Language Learning*. 54, 153-188.
- Lyddon, Paul A. 2011. The Efficacy of Corrective Feedback and Textual Enhancement in Promoting the Acquisition of Grammatical Redundancies. *Modern Language Journal*. 95, 104-129.
- Lyster, Roy. 1998. Recasts, repetition, and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 20, 51-81.
- Lyster, Roy. 2001. Negotiation of form, recasts and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 51, 265-301.

- Lyster, Roy. 2004. Differential effects on prompts and recasts in form-focused instruction. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 26, 399-432.
- Lyster, Roy. 2007. Learning and Teaching languages through content: a counterbalanced approach. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Lyster, Roy and Leila Ranta. 1997. Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*. 19, 37-66.
- Lyster, Roy and Kazuya Saito. 2010. Oral Corrective Feedback in Classroom SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 32, 265– 302
- Mackey, Alison and Rhonda Oliver. 2003. International Context and Feedback in Child ESL Classrooms. *The Modern Language Journal*. 87, 4, 519-533.
- Mackey, Alison and Jenefer Philp. 1998. Conversational Interaction and second language development: Recasts, Responses, and Red Herrings? *The Modern Language Journal*, 82:3, 338-356.
- Markee, Numa. 2000. *Conversation Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Markee, Numa and Gabriele Kasper. 2004. Classroom talks: An introduction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88: 4, 491-500.
- Mori, Junko. 2004. Negotiating sequential boundaries and learning opportunities: A case from a Japanese language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 88:4, 536-550.
- National Curriculum = Põhikooli Riiklik Õppekava. Vabariigi Valisuse 2010. a määruse nr 14 "Põhikooli Riiklik Õppekava" lisa 2 Ainevaldkond Võõrkeeled. Available at https://www.riigiteataja.ee/akti/isa/1280/8201/3007/VV1_lisa2.pdf, accessed Sept, 2014.
- Netten, Joan. 1991. "Towards a more language oriented second language classroom." In *Language, Culture and Cognition*. L. Malavé and G. Duquette (eds.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Nobuyoshi, Junko and Rod Ellis. 1993. Focused communication tasks and second language acquisition. *ELT Journal*, 47, 203-210.
- Panova, Iliana and Roy Lyster. 2002. Patterns of corrective feedback and uptake in an adult ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*. 36, 573-595.
- Paradowsk, Michal, B. 2007. Utility of formal instruction and focus on form in language teaching. Exploring the L1/L2 Interface. A Study of Polish Advanced EFL Learners. *Institute of English Studies, University of Warsaw*, 64–85.
- Pica, Teresa. 1988. Interlanguage adjustments as outcome of NS-NNS negotiated interaction. *Language Learning*, 38, 45-73.
- Rezaei, Saeed. 2011. Corrective Feedback in SLA: Classroom Practice and Future Directions. *International Journal of English Linguistics*. 1, 21-29.
- Russell, and Nina Spada. 2006. Contextualizing corrective feedback in second language writing pedagogy. *Language Teaching Research*. 14, 445-463.
- Saeidi, Mahnaz and Larry Chong. 2003. Focus on form approach in an EFL context. *ELT Journal* 57/2: 280-289.
- Saxton, Matthew. 1997. The Contrast Theory of negative input. *Journal of Child Language*. 24, 139-161.

- Schachter, J. 1991. Corrective feedback in historical perspective. *Second Language Research*, 7, 89-102.
- Seedhouse, Paul. 1997 The case of the missing “no”: The relationship between pedagogy and interaction. *Language Learning*, 47:3, 547-583.
- Seedhouse, Paul. 2004. *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Blackwell Publishing,
- Seedhouse, Paul. 2005. Conversation Analysis and Language Learning. *Language Teaching*, 38:04, 165-187.
- Sheen, Young. 2004. Corrective Feedback and learner uptake in communicative classrooms across instructional settings. *Language Teaching Research*, 8:3, 263-300.
- Sheen, Young. 2010. Differential effects of oral and written corrective feedback in the ESL classroom. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 32: 2, 201-234.
- Schegloff, Emanuel A. 1997. ‘Whose Text? Whose Context?’ *Discourse & Society* 8: 165–87.
- Slimani, A. 1992. *Evaluation of classroom interaction*. In C. Anderson and A. Bretta (Eds.), *Evaluating Second Language Education*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Sharwood M. 1993. Input enhancement in instructed SLA. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 165-179.
- TED Talks Education. 2013. Teachers need real feedback: Bill Gates. Available at http://www.ted.com/talks/bill_gates_teachers_need_real_feedback, accessed Sept 21, 2014.
- Truscott, John. 1999. The Case for “The Case Against Grammar Correction in L2 Writing Classes”: A Response to Ferris. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 8, 2, 111-122.
- Van Patten, B. 1994. Evaluating the role of consciousness in second language acquisition: Terms, linguistic features and research methodology. *AILA Review*, 11, 27–36.
- Wong, Jean and Hun Waring. 2010. *Conversation analysis and second language pedagogy: A guide for ESL/EFL teachers*. New York: Routledge.
- Yang, Yingli. 2008. Corrective feedback and Chinese learners’ acquisition of English past tense. PhD dissertation, McGill University.

APPENDIX 1

Transcription conventions

Transcription conventions are abridged and adapted from Arkinson and Heritage by Numa Markee, 2000.

Identify of speakers:

T:	teacher
L1:	identified learner (Learner 1)
L:	unidentified learner
L3?:	probably Learner 3
LL:	several or all learners simultaneously

Simultaneous utterances

L1: //yes//	
L2: //yeh//	simultaneous, overlapping talk by two speakers
L1: //huh?//oh//I see//	
L2: //what//	
L3: //I don't get it//	simultaneous, overlapping talk by three (or more)

Contiguous utterances

=	a) turn continues at the next identical symbol on the next line
	b) if inserted at the end of one speaker's turn and the beginning of the next turn, it indicates that there is no gap at all between two turns

Intervals within and between utterances

(0.5)	a number in brackets indicates a time gap in tenths of a second
(.)	a dot indicates a pause of less of a second

Characteristics of speech delivery

↑	rising intonation
!	strong emphasis, with falling intonation
yes.	a period indicates falling (final) intonation
so,	a comma indicates low-rising intonation suggesting continuation
go:::d	one or more colons indicates lengthening of the preceding sound; each additional colon represents a lengthening of one beat
no-	a hyphen indicates an abrupt cut-off, with level pitch
<u>because</u>	<u>underlined</u> type indicates marked stress
SYLVIA	capitals indicate increased volume

◦the next thing◦ degree sign indicates decreased volume

<hhh> in-drawn breath

hhh exhaled breath

(hhh) laughter tokens

Commentary in the transcript

((coughs)) comment about actions noted in the transcript

((unintelligible)) indicates a stretch of talk that is unintelligible to the analyst

(radio) single parentheses indicate unclear or probable item

Other transcript symbols

includ[]s brackets indicate phonetic transcription draws attention to a particular phenomenon the analyst wishes to discuss

at the bottom of the sea bold font shows material which is subsequently re-used in later talk

(NM: Class 1, Group 1) initials after an excerpt identify the source of the transcript being quoted

APPENDIX 2

Collection of examples

Example 1

- 1 L1 I ate some cornflakes and uh: (0.2) dranked (.) some yoghurt
 2 T I drank, mhm.
 3 (0.7)
 4 T drank (0.1) the third sentence ((Kristina)) please

Example 2

- 1 T what did you do □ this morning
 2 L1 (0.1) I sleep
 3 T =you slept
 4 LL //slept//
 5 L1 mhm.
 6 T (0.1) did you do anything else □
 7 L1 (0.1) no.
 8 T did you wake up □
 9 L1 (0.1) no.
 8 T =you didn't wake up □
 9 L1 no.
 10 T =you're still sleeping □
 11 L1 (hhh)
 12 LL //(hhh)//
 13 T okay.-

Example 3

- 1 L1 he also going to visit-
 2 T = he's
 L1 (0.3) he's also going to visit some Tibetan people in their tents.

Example 4

- 1 T what time did you come to school.
 2 L1 I (0.2) come to school-
 3 T = I came-
 4 L1 I came to school (0.3) at half past eight =

T mhm, okay.

Example 5

1 L1 this book was (0.2) ◦((unintelligible)) in 2007 ◦ =
 2 T = I'm sorry (0.1) what did you say
 3 L1 (0.1) this book was written
 2 T written (0.1) right.

Example 6

1 L1 we (0.1) have arr[ei]- (0.1) arr[ein]- ◦arrange- //huh?//◦=
 2 T = could you speak up please,
 3 L2 //arranged//
 4 L1 we have arranged to: =
 5 T = right

Example 7

1 L1 she's really upset because her bicycle (0.1) steal (0.5) a:: (0.1) was steal-
 2 T = could you repeat please
 3 L1 she's really upset because her bicycle was stole-
 4 T did you say was sto:: -
 5 L1 ◦stole◦
 6 T I couldn't really hear the end of the word (0.2) could say the verb form once
 again (0.3) the bicycle was-
 7 L1 was steal- (0.1) stoled
 8 T what are the three forms of steal=
 11 LL = //steal stole stolen//=
 10 T = so (0.3) the bicycle: -
 11 L1 was stolen.
 12 T right. good.

Example 8

1 T how did you come to school,
 2 L1 (0.2) I come to school by car
 3 T I::↑
 4 L1 = I came to school by car.
 T okay.

Example 9

- 1 L1 he lives there for two years and he loves it.
 2 T alright. for two years₂ (0,2) so he:: =
 3 LL = //has// =
 4 L2? = has lived

Example 10

- 1 L1 next week we will see the (..) U2 live, we've bought the tickets
 2 T next week-
 3 L1 we will going to see-
 4 T so what do you think (.) if this is a concert (..) and I'm talking about my plans about it, is it something I've decided before or I have just decided
 5 L1 before
 6 T so, (0.3) if it's done before, (0.1) you need what ↑
 7 L1 we're going to see.
 8 T right. Okay. (0.2) did you understand why ↑
 9 L1 yes.
 10 T okay.

Example 11

- 1 L1 Harry Potter and the Chamber of Secrets (filled) ((unintelligible))
 2 T you need two words in the gap.
 3 L1 (.) a:h, were filled (0.1) ei was filled
 4 T okay.

Example 12

- 1 L1 when were first television picture produced
 2 T television picture. (0.1) is it singular or plural
 3 LL //singular//
 4 T singular! (0.1) what do you need to use then if the word's in singular
 5 L1 maybe wa::s (0.1) was-
 6 T right (0.2) so can you form the question once more now please
 7 L1 when was the first television picture produced
 8 T okay.

Example 13

- 1 L1 I didn't know (who men) were-
 2 T = could you repeat the fifth gap once more as I didn't catch what you said
 3 L1 (0.5) zero article
 4 T I didn't know who men were ↑ (0.5) have we spoken about these men before
 5 L1 oh:, yeah (0.1) the
 6 T so, the::
 7 L1 (0.5) the men were
 8 T right.

Example 14

- 1 L1 I don't want to do my English homework now, I think I'm going to do it tomorrow instead
 9 T (...) what did you say, I::
 10 L1 I'm going-
 4 T but it's right now, you decided right now (...) you don't want to do it right now so you decide now that (...) you'll do it tomorrow (...)
 5 L1 hhh
 6 LL //(cough)// //laughter//
 7 T okay, it's will (0.1) as you decide now
 11 (0.2)
 12 T Okay (0.1) I'm giving you some grammar sheets to practice some more

Example 15

- 1 L1 1 L1 e::rm (0.1) He laughs so much when he (0.2) when the clown doctor's here. a:: (0.1) James had three (0.3) e: (0.1) ((coughs)) -
 2 T = you have to use present perfect.
 3 L1 e: (..)
 4 T what does it consist of, (0.2) you have to use an auxiliary verb and the past participle of have.
 5 L1 (...)
 6 T he::
 7 L1 (0.2) ohe:°(0.5)
 8 T he:: (0.1) talon olnud
 9 L2 he have had.
 10 T he:::↑
 11 LL //he has had//

- 12 L3 he has had three operations.
- 13 LL //he has had three operations// //he have had-//
- 14 T I heard two different versions, which is right ↑
- 15 L1 has had =
- 16 T = go on
- 17 L1 James has had three operations [s ai n c] last month.
- 18 T what is the word before last month ↑
- 19 L1 m::: =
- 20 T = has had three operations,
- 21 L1 since
- 22 since (0.1) yes (0.1) do you know what it means↑
- 23L1 e:: (0.2) alates =
- 24 T = yes, (0.1) alateseelmisestkuust. right.

RESÜMEE

TARTU ÜLIKOOL

MAAILMA KEELTE JA KULTUURIDE KOLLEDŽ

Merli Leemet

Oral Corrective Feedback in pre-intermediate level EFL classroom

Suuline parandav tagasiside madalama keskastme inglise keele tunnis

Magistritöö

2015

Lehekülgede arv: 65

Annotatsioon:

Käesoleva juhtumianalüüsi eesmärk oli uurida üksikasjalikult, milliseid suulise tagasiside parandusstrateegiaid õpetaja tunnis kasutab ning kui täpselt tajuvad õpilased vormile ja täpsusele orienteeritud vigade parandamise protsessi kui pedagoogiline eesmärk on keskenduda ütluse vormilisele õigsusele. Lähemisviisiks sellele teemale valiti vestlusanalüüs (CA): mõned audio-salvestatud suhtluse fragmendid ja valitud transkribeeritud killud suhtlusaktidest ning nende analüüs. Sissejuhatuses on toodud uurimustöö põhjendus ja töö eesmärgid, samuti ülevaade töö struktuurist. Esimene peatükk sisaldab ülevaadet vigade parandamise rollist õpetamisel ning toob välja erinevad tüübid suulise parandava tagasiside (CF) andmiseks SLA (teise keele omandamine) mõttes ja käsitleb traditsioonilist õpetaja-õpilase suhtlust võrrelduna klassis toimuva suhtlemisega CA perspektiivis. Viimane näeb klassiruumi mitte ühe sotsiaalse kontekstina, vaid diskursusena, kus õpetajad ja õppijad ehitavad koostöös mitmeid kontekste. CA raames kuulub CF paranduse hulka ja on oluline mõista vea käsitlust nii CA kui ka SLA põhivoolu uuringutes. Sellele järgneb ülevaade vormile ja tähendusele keskendunud juhendamise eristamisest. Teine peatükk tegeleb metodoloogia ja andmete kogumise ja analüüsi protseduuriga. Valitud suhtlemis fragmente liigitatakse ja analüüsitakse sõltuvalt parandava tagasiside vormist. Sellele järgneb arutelu, kus töö tulemusi vaadeldakse veidi lähemalt.

Analüüs näitas, et õpetaja kasutab tunnis kõiki kuut töö teoreetilises osas kirjeldatud parandus strateegiat. Uurimuses osalenud õpetaja praktikant kasutas kogenud ning parandus strateegiatega kursis olnud õpetajaga võrreldes rohkem otsest parandamist pakkudes õpilase eksimuse korralise õige vormi. Kõige tulemuslikumad olid võtted, kus õpetaja suunab õpilast ise oma viga parandama ilma õiget vormi ise pakkumata. Sellisel juhul oli kõige selgemini järeldatav ka õpilase enda mõistmine õige vormi moodustamise käigust. Kui õpetaja peab korduvalt, kasutades erinevaid parandamis strateegiaid, alkatama õpilase eneseparandamise, liituvad mõnikord ka teised õpilased parandusega ja üheskoos viiakse see täide. Sellistes olukordades kulus küll vea parandamiseni jõudmiseks rohkem aega, kuid saab järeldada, et saades õpetaja poolt mõningast keelesist tuge, on õpilased võimelised leidma nii oma kui ka üksteise vigu.

Märksõnad: Parandav tagasiside, vestlusanalüüs, tagasiside, parandamisstrateegiad, eneseparandus, õpetaja algatatud eneseparandus

Lihtlitsents lõputöö reprodutseerimiseks ja lõputöö üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks

Mina Merli Leemet (17.06.1980)

1. annan Tartu Ülikoolile tasuta loa (lihtlitsentsi) enda loodud teose

ORAL CORRECTIVE FEEDBACK IN PRE-INTERMEDIATE LEVEL EFL CLASSROOM,

mille juhendaja on Natalja Zagura,

- 1.1.reprodutseerimiseks säilitamise ja üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemise eesmärgil, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace-is lisamise eesmärgil kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni;
- 1.2.üldsusele kättesaadavaks tegemiseks Tartu Ülikooli veebikeskkonna kaudu, sealhulgas digitaalarhiivi DSpace'i kaudu kuni autoriõiguse kehtivuse tähtaja lõppemiseni.
2. olen teadlik, et punktis 1 nimetatud õigused jäävad alles ka autorile.
3. kinnitan, et lihtlitsentsi andmisega ei rikuta teiste isikute intellektuaalomandi ega isikuandmete kaitse seadusest tulenevaid õigusi.

Tartus

20.05.2015